

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Tools of Empowerment (Compiled Final Report)

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	See Report	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	See Report	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 7-4:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Provider submitted corrective action plan addressing concerns detailed from initial monitoring visit.

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Tools of Empowerment’s document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Tools of Empowerment
1st DATE: 1-25-07, 2nd DATE: 3-6-07, 3rd DATE: 3-20-07
1st SITE: Thomas Gregg IPS#15 2302 E. Michigan Street, 2nd SITE: TC Steele Elementary School #98 (IPS), 3rd SITE: Riverside Elementary #44 (IPS)
TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1st site: J.L., T.O., & J.D., 2nd site: 3 tutors, 3rd site: 4 tutors
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 1st site: 4:20pm, 2nd site: 4:35pm, 3rd site: 4:40pm
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1st site: 3, 2nd site: 3, 3rd site: n/a post assessments

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X	<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Three groups of students were observed during the tutoring session. One group of students worked on math workbook pages that focused on division. Another group of students worked on social studies homework, math worksheets on cost comparison word problems, or test booklets (2 students). A third group of students started working on a math worksheet on counting by 5’s and 10’s and then switched to another worksheet when it appeared they were not able to work appropriately on the math worksheet.</p> <p>Observed lessons did not always match original description in provider application. In some cases, it did not always appear that the session was organized, based on any predetermined lesson plans, or that tutoring was individualized to address each student’s weaknesses. The application states manipulatives or games would be used to “teach computation including...multiplication/division facts...”, however, during the division lesson in math, no manipulatives were observed as students were only seen completing workbook pages. In addition, most of the groups observed did not appear to be using many of the curriculum items detailed in the application including but not limited to items such as the CARS, phonics, or hands-on/minds-on activities. Lastly, while it is feasible for students to spend some time (15 minutes or so) working on homework, several students were observed to be working on homework an hour into the tutoring session.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Three groups of students worked with three tutors. In the first group, curricular materials were on the table, but it appeared that two students in the group were still working on homework. Students were provided assistance when they asked for answering questions. One student in the group worked on a packet of worksheets and was provided assistance when asked. In another location, one child worked independently on worksheets (math). Instructor provided assistance when asked and seemed to have good rapport with student. Instructor provided a lot of support for child. In third group, students worked on workbook pages (math and language arts). While tutors did use <i>Tools</i> curricula as described in original application (i.e., students worked on workbook pages provided through <i>Tools</i> curricula), instructors did not appear to be actively using manipulatives, games, and</p>

			<p>other instructional strategies to ensure that students understood concepts and were able to link to broader literacy and math concepts (beyond just completing the workbook pages and being provided with correct answers when the students were incorrect). Additionally, a few students appeared to be completing homework assignments for the entire lesson with very little tutor interaction or feedback.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Multiple groups of students worked on post-testing. When students were finished post-testing, they worked on workbook pages in the Tools of Empowerment curriculum. Students working on workbook pages were provided with assistance when necessary. There was some concern related to the ways in which post-assessments were administered. Younger children (grades K-1) were given the assessment orally. However, in some cases, it appeared that tutors coached students to the correct answer, or even changed answers after coaching the students or giving the students multiple opportunities to “guess” the answer. Older students generally completed post-assessments without assistance, but even some of these students were provided assistance with questions that they found difficult. Coaching such as this hurts the reliability and validity of assessment results.</p>
Instruction is clear	X		<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Little instruction was observed. When reviewers first arrived, students were in the middle of snack time. Thirty minutes later when reviewers returned, reviewers found that one tutor was working with a group of students on math workbook pages while the remaining two tutors did not appear to have begun working with the other students until the reviewers approached. The tutor who was working with the group of students on math workbook pages and the tutor who began working with students completing their homework (once reviewers returned) both assisted students when they requested help with their assignments.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>While the tutors had a good rapport with the students and appeared to know which workbook pages to assign, they did not provide much instruction beyond assistance when requested or checking the completion of workbook pages. In some instances, tutors just provided the correct answers for students working on the workbook pages instead of offering strategies or linking to higher order thinking skills.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Tutors helped students complete workbook pages if they had completed their post-assessments. Assistance was provided for completing workbook pages. As noted above, instruction provided during the completion of the post-assessments was not always appropriate.</p>
Time on task is appropriate	X		<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>While some students remained on task, one group of students was continuously off task. These students argued with each other, teased each other, or talked about subject matter that was not related to their assignment even after several attempts by their tutor to redirect them. At times, this group created a distraction to other students that were on task. In addition, it appeared that some students were not always clear on what tasks they should complete when they finished an assignment. In some cases, this led to a few students sitting with nothing to do for a period of time.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Students generally on task, although at times students were not sure what to do when they completed their assigned workbook pages. Tutors did a good job redirecting students who were off task.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Students were generally on task and focused on post-assessments or workbook pages.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		<u>VISIT #1</u>

		<p>The tutor working with the off task group of students was not able to engage the students and appeared to have difficulty with classroom management/behavior issues. In addition, this tutor’s attempts to provide instruction on the worksheets that were given to students were not effective (students did not understand the directions and tutor was not able to use examples or alternative explanations to clarify the assignment). However, the tutor working with a few students on word problems demonstrated appropriate student engagement techniques by reviewing the questions the students missed, re-explaining the questions, guiding the students in using the appropriate problem-solving concepts and then asking the students questions to check for clarity.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Tutors appeared familiar with the <i>Tools</i> curriculum and understood which workbook pages to assign to students. Tutors were able to maintain good rapport with students and provided positive feedback. However, tutors tended to show or tell the answers to students as opposed to having students practice or come up with the correct answer on their own. Tutors generally did not offer processes or instructional strategies for increasing students’ understanding of concepts beyond providing correct answers to workbook pages or requesting that students redo answers that were incorrect (though no strategies or assistance was provided to help students come up with the correct answer). Tutors tended to reinforce discrete skills (such as completing multiplication tables on the worksheet) as opposed to integrating these skills into broader mathematical and literacy concepts. Tutors did not generally introduce or “teach” concepts but instead provided correction or specific assistance in answering a particular question.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Tutors did not always appear to understand clearly how post-assessments were to be administered. In some cases, tutors coached students to the correct answers, gave students hints to help them get to the correct answer, or erased incorrect answers and let students guess until they got the correct answer. It did not appear that tutors were trained in how to administer post-assessments to maximize reliability of results. Tutors who were working with students who had finished post-assessments provided assistance to them, although it was often in the form of correcting workbook pages.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: <u>6-5:1</u>	X	<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 7-4:1 and that instruction will be in small groups. A 6-5:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>At 3:1, the student/instructor ratio was lower than that described in the provider’s original application.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Matches description in provider application.</p>